

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

## ALONZO EDWARDS, SR.,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:17-cv-196

VS.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,  
Defendant.

District Judge Walter H. Rice  
Magistrate Judge Michael J. Newman

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION<sup>1</sup> THAT: (1) THE NON-DISABILITY FINDING AT ISSUE BE FOUND UNSUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, AND REVERSED; (2) THIS MATTER BE REMANDED TO THE COMMISSIONER UNDER THE FOURTH SENTENCE OF 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) FOR PROCEEDINGS CONSISTENT WITH THIS OPINION; AND (3) THIS CASE BE CLOSED**

This is a Social Security disability benefits appeal. At issue is whether the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) erred in finding Plaintiff not “disabled” and therefore unentitled to Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) and/or Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”).<sup>2</sup> This case is before the Court upon Plaintiff’s Statement of Errors (doc. 9), the Commissioner’s memorandum in opposition (doc. 11), Plaintiff’s reply (doc. 12), the administrative record (doc. 6), and the record as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

I.

#### A. Procedural History

Plaintiff filed for DIB and SSI alleging a disability onset date of November 11, 2013. PageID 231-43. Plaintiff claims disability as a result of a number of alleged impairments

<sup>1</sup> Attached hereto is a NOTICE to the parties regarding objections to this Report and Recommendation.

<sup>2</sup> “The Commissioner’s regulations governing the evaluation of disability for DIB and SSI are identical . . . and are found at 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520, and 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520 respectively.” *Colvin v. Barnhart*, 475 F.3d 727, 730 (6th Cir. 2007). Citations in this Report and Recommendation to DIB regulations are made with full knowledge of the corresponding SSI regulations, and *vice versa*.

<sup>3</sup> Hereafter, citations to the electronically-filed record will refer only to the PageID number.

including, *inter alia*, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (“COPD”), a spine disorder, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, anxiety, and carpal tunnel syndrome. PageID 44.

After initial denial of his applications, Plaintiff received a hearing before ALJ Eric Anschuetz on November 12, 2015. PageID 64-93. The ALJ issued a written decision on March 2, 2016 finding Plaintiff not disabled. PageID 41-58. Specifically, the ALJ found at Step Five that, based upon Plaintiff’s residual functional capacity (“RFC”) to perform a reduced range of light work,<sup>4</sup> “there are jobs in that exist in significant numbers in the national economy that [he] can perform[.]” PageID 46-57.

Thereafter, the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request for review, making the ALJ’s non-disability finding the final administrative decision of the Commissioner. PageID 28-33. *See Casey v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 987 F.2d 1230, 1233 (6th Cir. 1993). Plaintiff then filed this timely appeal. *Cook v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 480 F.3d 432, 435 (6th Cir. 2007).

## B. Evidence of Record

The evidence of record is adequately summarized in the ALJ’s decision (PageID 44-56), Plaintiff’s Statement of Errors (doc. 9), the Commissioner’s memorandum in opposition (doc. 11), and Plaintiff’s reply (doc. 12). The undersigned incorporates all of the foregoing and sets forth the facts relevant to this appeal herein.

---

<sup>4</sup> Light work “involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds” and “requires a good deal of walking or standing, or . . . sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.” *Id.* § 404.1567(b). An individual who can perform light work is presumed also able to perform sedentary work. *Id.* Sedentary work “involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties.” *Id.* § 404.1567(a).

## II.

### **A. Standard of Review**

The Court's inquiry on a Social Security appeal is to determine (1) whether the ALJ's non-disability finding is supported by substantial evidence, and (2) whether the ALJ employed the correct legal criteria. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Bowen v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 478 F.3d 742,745-46 (6th Cir. 2007). In performing this review, the Court must consider the record as a whole. *Hephner v. Mathews*, 574 F.2d 359, 362 (6th Cir. 1978).

Substantial evidence is "such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971). When substantial evidence supports the ALJ's denial of benefits, that finding must be affirmed, even if substantial evidence also exists in the record upon which the ALJ could have found Plaintiff disabled. *Buxton v. Halter*, 246 F.3d 762, 772 (6th Cir. 2001). Thus, the ALJ has a "‘zone of choice’ within which he [or she] can act without the fear of court interference." *Id.* at 773.

The second judicial inquiry -- reviewing the correctness of the ALJ's legal analysis -- may result in reversal even if the ALJ's decision is supported by substantial evidence in the record. *Rabbers v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 582 F.3d 647, 651 (6th Cir. 2009). "[A] decision of the Commissioner will not be upheld where the [Social Security Administration] fails to follow its own regulations and where that error prejudices a claimant on the merits or deprives the claimant of a substantial right." *Bowen*, 478 F.3d at 746.

### **B. "Disability" Defined**

To be eligible for disability benefits, a claimant must be under a "disability" as defined by the Social Security Act. 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(1)(A). Narrowed to its statutory meaning, a "disability" includes physical and/or mental impairments that are both "medically determinable"

and severe enough to prevent a claimant from (1) performing his or her past job and (2) engaging in “substantial gainful activity” that is available in the regional or national economies. *Id.*

Administrative regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation for disability determinations. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a)(4). Although a dispositive finding at any step ends the ALJ’s review, *see Colvin v. Barnhart*, 475 F.3d 727, 730 (6th Cir. 2007), the complete sequential review poses five questions:

1. Has the claimant engaged in substantial gainful activity;
2. Does the claimant suffer from one or more severe impairments;
3. Do the claimant’s severe impairments, alone or in combination, meet or equal the criteria of an impairment set forth in the Commissioner’s Listing of Impairments (the “Listings”), 20 C.F.R. Subpart P, Appendix 1;
4. Considering the claimant’s RFC, can he or she perform his or her past relevant work; and
5. Assuming the claimant can no longer perform his or her past relevant work -- and also considering the claimant’s age, education, past work experience, and RFC -- do significant numbers of other jobs exist in the national economy which the claimant can perform?

20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a)(4); *see also Miller v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 181 F. Supp.2d 816, 818 (S.D. Ohio 2001). A claimant bears the ultimate burden of establishing disability under the Social Security Act’s definition. *Key v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 109 F.3d 270, 274 (6th Cir. 1997).

### **III.**

On appeal, Plaintiff argues that the ALJ erred: (1) in assessing his credibility; and (2) in explaining the weight accorded to record reviewing physicians Robert Wysokinski, M.D. and Gary Hinzman, M.D. Doc. 9 at PageID 923. Finding error in the ALJ’s assessment of the record reviewing physicians’ opinions, the Court does not specifically address the numerous arguments advanced by Plaintiff regarding the ALJ’s credibility assessment. Instead, the undersigned would direct that the ALJ consider Plaintiff’s arguments regarding credibility on remand.

Until March 27, 2017, “the Commissioner’s regulations [that apply to this appeal] establish[ed] a hierarchy of acceptable medical source opinions[.]” *Snell v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:12-cv-119, 2013 WL 372032, at \*9 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 30, 2013). In descending order, these medical source opinions are: (1) treaters; (2) examiners; and (3) record reviewers. *Id.* Under the regulations in effect prior to March 27, 2017, the opinions of treaters are entitled to the greatest deference because they “are likely to be . . . most able to provide a detailed, longitudinal picture of [a claimant’s] medical impairment(s) and may bring a unique perspective to the medical evidence that cannot be obtained from the objective medical findings alone or from reports of individual examinations[.]” 20 C.F.R. § 416.927(c)(2).

A treater’s opinions must be given “controlling weight” if “well-supported by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques and . . . not inconsistent with the other substantial evidence in [the] case record.” *LaRiccia v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 549 F. App’x 377, 384 (6th Cir. 2013). Even if a treater’s opinions is not entitled to controlling weight, “the ALJ must still determine how much weight is appropriate by considering a number of factors, including the length of the treatment relationship and the frequency of examination, the nature and extent of the treatment relationship, supportability of the opinions, consistency of the opinions with the record as a whole, and any specialization of the treating physician.” *Blakley v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 581 F.3d 399, 406 (6th Cir. 2009); *see also* 20 C.F.R. § 416.927(c).

After treaters, “[n]ext in the hierarchy are examining physicians and psychologists, who often see and examine claimants only once.” *Snell*, 2013 WL 372032, at \*9.

Record reviewers like Drs. Wysokinski and Hinzman are afforded the least deference and these “non-examining physicians’ opinions are on the lowest rung of the hierarchy of medical source opinions.” *Id.* “The regulations provide progressively more rigorous tests for weighing

opinions as the ties between the source of the opinion and the individual [claimant] become weaker.” *Id.* (citing SSR 96-6p, 1996 WL 374180, at \*2 (July 2, 1996)).

In this case, there were no treating physician opinions and, instead, the ALJ relied on the opinions of record reviewers -- Drs. Wysokinski and Hinzman -- in assessing Plaintiff’s physical limitations. PageID 55. Both of these record reviewers concluded that Plaintiff could perform light work with other non-exertional limitations. *See* PageID 104-06, 120-22. The ALJ gave these opinions “great weight, concluding that “they are generally consistent with the objective evidence and [Plaintiff’s] subjective reports.” Doc. 55. The ALJ provided no further explanation regarding how objective evidence of record supports these opinions.

This Court, on a number of occasions, has concluded that such conclusory analysis of record reviewing opinions amounts to reversible error. *See Hollon v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 142 F. Supp.3d 577, 584 (S.D. Ohio 2015); *Marks v. Colvin*, 201 F. Supp.3d 870, 884 (S.D. Ohio 2016); *Laning v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:15-CV-75, 2016 WL 1729650, at \*6 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 28, 2016); *Boyd v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:16-CV-477, 2018 WL 300174, at \*3 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 5, 2018); *Marshall v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:16-CV-190, 2017 WL 4324763, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 29, 2017); *Boyd v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:16-CV-506, 2018 WL 739103, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 7, 2018); *Dowell v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:16-CV-451, 2018 WL 671340, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 2, 2018); *Logan v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:16-CV-480, 2018 WL 300175, at \*4 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 5, 2018); *Worden v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:14-CV-438, 2016 WL 860694, at \*6 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2016); *Hale v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:15-CV-360, 2017 WL 1190543, at \*8 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 30, 2017); *Jones v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:15-CV-00428, 2017 WL 540923, at \*6 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 10, 2017). Consistent with the foregoing authority, the undersigned finds the ALJ’s analysis of the record reviewers’ opinions unsupported by substantial evidence and, thus, reversal and remand appropriate.

#### **IV.**

When, as here, the ALJ's non-disability determination is unsupported by substantial evidence, the Court must determine whether to reverse and remand the matter for rehearing, or to reverse and order an award of benefits. The Court has authority to affirm, modify or reverse the Commissioner's decision "with or without remanding the cause for rehearing." 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 100 (1991). Generally, benefits may be awarded immediately "only if all essential factual issues have been resolved and the record adequately establishes a plaintiff's entitlement to benefits." *Faucher v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 17 F.3d 171, 176 (6th Cir. 1994); *see also Abbott v. Sullivan*, 905 F.2d 918, 927 (6th Cir. 1990); *Varley v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 820 F.2d 777, 782 (6th Cir. 1987). In this instance, evidence of disability is not overwhelming, and remand for further proceedings -- as specifically set forth above -- is proper.

#### **V.**

**IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:** (1) the Commissioner's non-disability finding be found unsupported by substantial evidence, and **REVERSED**; (2) this matter be **REMANDED** to the Commissioner under the Fourth Sentence of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for proceedings consistent with this opinion; and (3) this case be **CLOSED**.

Date: February 26, 2018

---

Michael J. Newman  
United States Magistrate Judge

## **NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with this Report and Recommendation. This period is not extended by virtue of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d) if served on you by electronic means, such as via the Court's CM/ECF filing system. If, however, this Report and Recommendation was served upon you by mail, this deadline is extended to **SEVENTEEN DAYS** by application of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d). Parties may seek an extension of the deadline to file objections by filing a motion for extension, which the Court may grant upon a showing of good cause.

Any objections filed shall specify the portions of the Report and Recommendation objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based, in whole or in part, upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs.

A party may respond to another party's objections within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with a copy thereof. As noted above, this period is not extended by virtue of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d) if served on you by electronic means, such as via the Court's CM/ECF filing system. If, however, this Report and Recommendation was served upon you by mail, this deadline is extended to **SEVENTEEN DAYS** by application of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal.

*See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 153-55 (1985); United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).*